## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA WESTERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)
V.	) 5:10-HC-2022-BC
CARLOS OFARRIT-FIGUEROA,	)
RESPONDENT.	)

STATUS CONFERENCE
NOVEMBER 23, 2010
BEFORE THE HONORABLE TERRENCE W. BOYLE
U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

## FOR THE GOVERNMENT:

MR. NORMAN ACKER ASST. U.S. ATTORNEY 310 NEW BERN AVE. RALEIGH, NC

## FOR THE RESPONDENT:

MS. SUZANNE LITTLE
ASST. FEDERAL PUBLIC DEFENDER
P.O. BOX 25967
RALEIGH, NC

MR. SCOTT ELLIOT BAYZLE ATTORNEY AT LAW P.O. BOX 389 RALEIGH, NC

COURT REPORTER: DONNA J. TOMAWSKI STENOTYPE WITH COMPUTER AIDED TRANSCRIPTION

1 NOVEMBER 23, 2010 MS. LITTLE: GOOD MORNING. THIS IS MR. BAYZLE. 2 3 MR. BAYZLE: I'M SCOTT BAYZLE. MR. BUTLER IS 4 ALSO HERE AS WELL. MS. LITTLE: WE WERE DISCUSSING WITH THE 5 INTERPRETER. I'M NOT SURE IF OUR CLIENT WANTS TO HAVE 6 7 EVERYTHING INTERPRETED OR JUST IF HE HAS OUESTIONS. THE COURT: WE'LL SWEAR THE INTERPRETER AND MAKE 8 9 DO. 10 (INTERPRETER SWORN.) 11 MR. ACKER, ON ANOTHER POINT, IN AN APPEAL, WHAT'S THE 12 PROCEDURE IF YOU PREVAIL? CAN YOU APPEAL FROM A CASE THAT YOU WON, OR IS THAT --13 14 MR. ACKER: I WOULDN'T THINK SO, YOUR HONOR. I THINK THE OTHER SIDE WOULD APPEAL. 15 16 THE COURT: I'M NOT TRYING TO BE CLEVER WITH YOU 17 AT ALL, BUT TO THE EXTENT THAT YOU WON, IN BRONCHEAU AND THE STATUTE WAS HELD TO BE CONSTITUTIONAL, AREN'T THERE --18 19 I MEAN, HOW BROAD A PLAYING FIELD DO YOU HAVE TO APPEAL? 20 (RESPONDENT ENTERS INTO THE COURTROOM.) 21 IS IT THAT YOU DIDN'T GET THE OUTCOME THAT YOU 22 SPECIFICALLY WANTED BUT YOU GOT A FAVORABLE OUTCOME? 23 IT'S LIKE THE GUY IN THE SLIP AND FALL CASE WHO 24 WANTED \$1 MILLION AND THE JURY GAVE HIM 50,000 AND HE SAID, WHERE'S MY OTHER \$950,000? I'M GOING TO TAKE THIS 25

1 AS HIGH AS I CAN. THEY SAID, YOU KNOW, WE'RE SORRY BUT
2 THE 50 WILL HAVE TO DO.

MR. ACKER: I WOULD ENVISION, YOUR HONOR, THERE
COULD BE LOTS OF DIFFERENT OUTCOMES IN BRONCHEAU AND WE
JUST HAVE TO SEE ON WHAT BASIS THE 4TH CIRCUIT RULED. IF
THEY RULED YOUR ORDER WAS INAPPROPRIATE, THEY WOULD
ARTICULATE WHY AND THEN, I WOULD IMAGINE, THEY WOULD
REMAND IT AND WE WOULD BE BACK BEFORE YOUR HONOR TO HANDLE
IT BASED ON THEIR RATIONALE.

THE COURT: WHAT HAPPENS IF IN ONE OF THESE

2255'S, LIKE THE GENTLEMAN WHO IS NOT HERE, IF THE JUDGE

DOES SOMETHING IN THE CRIMINAL CASE, AND I KNOW THIS IS

HYPOTHETICAL AND AN ADVISORY KIND OF QUESTION, BUT SUPPOSE

THE JUDGE DOES SOMETHING TO VACATE THE CRIMINAL SENTENCE

BUT YOU STILL HAVE THE PERSON NOW CIVILLY. WOULD YOU KEEP

HIM?

MR. ACKER: I THOUGHT ABOUT THAT QUESTION, YOUR HONOR. I HAVEN'T RESEARCHED THAT QUESTION TO FIND OUR POSITION ON THAT.

THE COURT: YOU COULD HAVE A CLAIM WITHOUT AN ANTECEDENT SENTENCE.

MR. ACKER: WELL, IT'S MY UNDERSTANDING IN THAT

CASE THAT THE DEFENDANT IN THAT CASE ARGUED THAT HE WOULD

NOT HAVE PLED GUILTY. SO I PRESUME HIS REMEDY IN THE

25 2255 --

**THE COURT:** VACATE THE PLEA.

MR. ACKER: VACATE THE PLEA, AND IT WOULD GO TO
TRIAL. THEN WE WOULD GO FROM THERE. BUT THERE ARE A LOT
OF UNANSWERED OUESTIONS ON THOSE KIND OF PERMUTATIONS.

THE COURT: WHAT ABOUT PEOPLE WHO ARE

CERTIFIED -- THEY'RE INDICTED AND ARRESTED AND DETAINED

AND THEN YOU COME IN FRONT OF ME WITH SOME GROUNDS, EITHER

SIDE, AND I SEND THEM TO BUTNER FOR 90 DAYS OR 120 DAYS.

ARE THEY IN THE CUSTODY OF THE BUREAU OF PRISONS OR THE

ATTORNEY GENERAL?

MR. ACKER: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE STATUTE

SPECIFICALLY SAYS THAT PEOPLE -- WELL, IF THEY HAVE BEEN

CERTIFIED.

THE COURT: COULD THEY BE CERTIFIED OUT OF THAT COMMITMENT? LIKE I COMMIT THEM TO THE BOP FOR SUCH AND SUCH STUDY AND THEN, FOR REASONS THAT WE DON'T KNOW, THE UNDERLYING CASE RESOLVES AND THEY'RE NOT GOING TO BE SENTENCED TO CUSTODY OR PRISON. BUT BECAUSE OF WHO THEY ARE, THEY GET A 4248 CERTIFICATION BEFORE THEY GET OUT. COULD THAT HAPPEN?

MR. ACKER: YOUR HONOR, I CAN ANSWER THAT IN

PART. IF THE COURT HAS MADE A DETERMINATION THAT THEY ARE

INCOMPETENT TO STAND TRIAL, BECAUSE UNDER 4241, THEN THE

STATUTE DOES ALLOW, IN THAT INSTANCE, FOR THEM TO BE THEN

CERTIFIED UNDER 4248.

THE COURT: WELL, THEY WOULD BE CERTIFIED FIRST 1 2 UNDER 4246 PROBABLY, IF THEY WERE INCOMPETENT TO STAND 3 TRIAL. 4 MR. ACKER: OR UNDER 4241, I BELIEVE. BUT IN 5 THAT INSTANCE THEY COULD BE CERTIFIED, AND THE STATUTE IS VERY SPECIFIC ABOUT THAT. IF YOU ARE ASKING A DIFFERENT 6 7 QUESTION, AND THAT IS WHETHER SIMPLY WHEN THEY ARE SENT FOR THE EVALUATION. 8 9 THE COURT: SUPPOSE THEY ARE NOT FOUND TO BE 10 INCOMPETENT. SUPPOSE THEY ARE FOUND TO BE COMPETENT 11 VIS-A-VIS UNDERSTANDING THE NATURE AND EXTENT OF THE 12 CHARGES AGAINST THEM AND COMPETENT IN TERMS OF RESPONDING 13 TO CRIMINAL PROCESS AND THE TRIAL BUT SEXUALLY DANGEROUS 14 AND SUFFERING FROM A SERIOUS MENTAL DISORDER. COULD THEY 15 BE CIVILLY COMMITTED THEN? 16 MR. ACKER: I DON'T KNOW THE ANSWER TO THAT 17 QUESTION, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: BUT THAT COULD HAPPEN. 18 19 MR. ACKER: I DON'T KNOW. 20 THE COURT: OR THAT CIRCUMSTANCE COULD. 21 MR. ACKER: CIRCUMSTANCES COULD HAPPEN, ALTHOUGH 22 I WOULD THINK THE NORMAL COURSE WOULD BE IF HE'S COMPETENT 23 TO STAND TRIAL HE WOULD STAND TRIAL, AND EITHER HE WOULD 24 GET A SENTENCE OR NOT GET A SENTENCE. THAT WOULD BE THE 25 MORE NORMAL COURSE BUT I HAVEN'T RESEARCHED THE ISSUE ON

1	THE SPECIFIC QUESTIONS YOU ASKED.
2	THE COURT: THANK YOU.
3	HOW DO YOU PRONOUNCE IT?
4	MS. LITTLE: OFARRIT.
5	THE COURT: DID MR. OFARRIT'S 2001 CONVICTION
6	COME FROM AN INTERNAL BOP CRIME?
7	MS. LITTLE: YES, YOUR HONOR, IT DID.
8	THE COURT: SO WHERE WAS HE WHERE WAS THE
9	CRIME COMMITTED?
10	MS. LITTLE: I'M NOT SURE.
11	MR. BAYZLE: YOUR HONOR, IT WAS IN TERRE HAUTE,
12	INDIANA.
13	THE COURT: AT THAT PENITENTIARY.
14	MR. BAYZLE: HE WAS BEING HELD FOR IMMIGRATION
15	REASONS AT THAT TIME.
16	THE COURT: HE WAS HELD THERE ON IMMIGRATION AT
17	THE TERRE HAUTE PRISON. I DON'T KNOW THE PRONUNCIATION
18	BUT I KNOW IT'S A MAJOR PRISON.
19	MR. BAYZLE: YES, YOUR HONOR.
20	THE COURT: HE COMMITTED A PREDATORY CRIME
21	THERE, WHICH HE EITHER PLED GUILTY TO OR WAS CONVICTED OF,
22	RIGHT?
23	MS. LITTLE: HE WENT TO TRIAL, YOUR HONOR.
24	THE COURT: AND HE WAS CONVICTED OF THAT.
25	MS. LITTLE: HE WAS CONVICTED.

1	THE COURT: AND SENTENCED TO 120-MONTHS AND
2	THREE YEARS OF SUPERVISED RELEASE.
3	MS. LITTLE: THAT'S CORRECT.
4	THE COURT: AND SO WHEN HE WAS DUE TO BE
5	RELEASED FROM HIS SENTENCE ON FEBRUARY 16 AND WAS
6	CERTIFIED SHORTLY BEFORE THAT?
7	MS. LITTLE: THAT'S CORRECT. HE WAS CERTIFIED
8	ON FEBRUARY 12 OF 2010.
9	THE COURT: DID HE HAVE AN IMMIGRATION DETAINER
10	AGAINST HIM?
11	MS. LITTLE: YES, HE DOES.
12	THE COURT: TO WHAT COUNTRY?
13	MS. LITTLE: HE CAME OVER ON PART OF THE MARIEL
14	BOATLIFT.
15	THE COURT: TO CUBA?
16	MS. LITTLE: YES, WHICH WE DON'T DEPORT PEOPLE
17	TO CUBA.
18	THE COURT: SO HE HAS AN ASYLUM STATUS?
19	MS. LITTLE: I DON'T KNOW ABOUT THE ASYLUM
20	STATUS. WE SPOKE WITH IMMIGRATION. THEY INDICATED WHEN
21	HE IS RELEASED HE WILL GO INTO ICE CUSTODY AND HE WILL BE
22	HELD THERE UNTIL THERE'S A DETERMINATION MADE AS TO
23	THE COURT: BECAUSE HE'S NOT GOING TO BE
24	TRANSITIONED INTO THE AMERICAN POPULATION.
25	MS. LITTLE: HE COULD BE. ICE ACTUALLY HAS

PEOPLE THAT SUPERVISE INDIVIDUALS FOR LIFE, AND HE WOULD 1 2 BE SUBJECT TO LIFETIME SUPERVISION TO AN ICE AGENT IF HE'S 3 RELEASED. 4 THEY HAVE TO MAKE A DETERMINATION, THEIR OWN 5 INDEPENDENT DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER HE'S DANGEROUS. IF HE'S CONSIDERED DANGEROUS, THEN THEY CAN HOLD HIM 6 7 APPARENTLY INDEFINITELY, AND THEY ACTUALLY HAVE SOME OF THESE PEOPLE THEY ARE HOLDING CURRENTLY IN FLORIDA. 8 9 APPARENTLY THERE'S A SPLIT IN THE CIRCUITS RIGHT NOW 10 BETWEEN I BELIEVE THE FIFTH AND TENTH CIRCUIT AS TO 11 WHETHER ICE CAN HOLD PEOPLE INDEFINITELY. THAT'S NOT BEEN 12 RESOLVED YET. BUT IF HE'S RELEASED, HE WOULD BE UNDER THE 13 SUPERVISION OF ICE. 14 THE COURT: HOW DO YOU PRONOUNCE IT, MARIANA 15 BOAT? MS. LITTLE: IT'S THE MARIEL BOATLIFT. 16 17 THE COURT: THAT HAPPENED IN THE LATE '80S? MS. LITTLE: THAT'S CORRECT. 18 19 MR. BAYZLE: 1980. 20 THE COURT: SO 30 YEARS AGO? 21 MS. LITTLE: RIGHT. 1980, HE WAS SENT TO A 22 REFUGEE CAMP IN WISCONSIN INITIALLY. 23 THE COURT: WHAT HAVE YOU FILED WITH RESPECT TO 24 HIS 4248 CASE? MS. LITTLE: WE FILED THE ORIGINAL MOTION TO 25

- DISMISS ON JULY 19 OF THIS, 2010, AND WE INTEND TO FILE A 1 2 SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION ALONG THE LINES OF THE BRONCHEAU 3 DECISION IN HIS CASE AS WELL. 4 THE COURT: AND MR. BAYZLE, YOU ARE REPRESENTING 5 HIM IN THE 2241? MR. BAYZLE: YES, YOUR HONOR. THERE'S TWO 6 PENDING MATTERS IN THE 2241. THE GOVERNMENT FILED A 7 MOTION TO DISMISS THE HABEAS PETITION ON JUNE 15, WHICH WE 9 FILED FORMAL OPPOSITION TO THAT. THE GOVERNMENT 10 SUBSEQUENTLY REQUESTED A STAY OF THAT, WHICH WE OPPOSED 11 AND THEN FILED A FORMAL OPPOSITION TO THE GOVERNMENT'S 12 MOTION TO STAY ANY PROCEEDINGS ON THE HABEAS PETITION. SO 13 THOSE ARE THE TWO PENDING MOTIONS RIGHT NOW ON THE HABEAS 14 MATTER. 15 THE COURT: WHAT IS YOUR CLAIM IN THE HABEAS, DOES IT TRACK THE TIMMS OPINION? 16 17 MR. BAYZLE: YES, YOUR HONOR, IT TRACKS THE TIMMS BASED ON A VARIETY OF REASONS FOR BOTH DUE PROCESS, 18 19 EQUAL PROTECTION, AND REALLY TRACKS ALL THE REASONS SET 20 OUT IN TIMMS. 21 YOUR HONOR, THE GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS IS 22 REALLY JUST BASED ON TWO ARGUMENTS. ONE, IS THAT THEY
- 22 REALLY JUST BASED ON TWO ARGUMENTS. ONE, IS THAT THEY
  23 ARGUE THAT IN THE LIGHT OF COMSTOCK, THE CONTINUED
  24 COMMITMENT IS CONSTITUTIONAL. AND THEN ALSO ARGUE THAT
  25 MR. FIGUEROA NEEDS TO SEEK HIS REMEDY IN THE 4248 AND NOT

1 IN THE HABEAS PETITION. 2 THE COURT: THEY ARE ARGUING THE LATER DEVELOPED 3 EXHAUSTION ARGUMENT, OR MAYBE IT'S NOT LATER DEVELOPED, 4 BUT THE EXHAUSTION ARGUMENT? MR. BAYZLE: I THINK THERE ARE REMEDIES 5 AVAILABLE WITHIN 4248 --6 7 THE COURT: THAT FORECLOSE HABEAS? WHAT DO YOU THINK OF THAT? THAT WAS ONE OF THE SALIENT ISSUES THAT 8 9 WAS RAISED IN SEPTEMBER IN THE APPELLATE COURT DURING ORAL 10 ARGUMENT, AND THE APPELLATE COURT HAS NOT YET HANDED DOWN 11 A DECISION IN COMSTOCK AND TIMMS. IN TIMMS, THEY WENT STRAIGHT AT WHETHER THEY OUGHT TO 12 13 DEFER ANY RULING UNTIL, OR AT LEAST THAT'S MY 14 UNDERSTANDING OF IT, UNTIL EXHAUSTION OCCURRED. 15 EXHAUSTION MEANING THAT YOU HAVE THE COLLATERAL PROCESS 16 INVOLVED IN 4248 AND YOU NEED TO HAVE THAT RUN ITS COURSE 17 BEFORE YOU CAN FILE A 2241. SOME WOULD SAY THAT'S A FAIRLY SHOCKING APPLICATION 18 19 OF HABEAS CORPUS, BUT I'D LIKE TO HEAR WHAT YOU WOULD SAY 20 ABOUT IT. 21 MR. BAYZLE: YOUR HONOR, AS THIS COURT HELD IN 22 TIMMS AT THE TRIAL LEVEL, 4248 DOES NOT PROVIDE ADEQUATE 23 PROCEDURES. 24 THE COURT: BUT YOU CAN'T CITE THAT TO ME HERE.

MR. BAYZLE: ABSOLUTELY, YOUR HONOR. I THINK IN

THIS ONE, IT IS DIFFICULT TO ARGUE THAT IF 4248 IN THE 1 2 PROCEDURES THAT IT PROVIDES IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND 3 VIOLATES THE DUE PROCESS LAWS, IT'S A HARD ARGUMENT THEN 4 TO ARGUE THAT YOU HAVE TO UTILIZE THOSE INSUFFICIENT PROCEDURES IN THE FIRST PLACE. I MEAN, IT HAS BEEN NINE 5 MONTHS SINCE CARLOS' RELEASE DATE AND I THINK DUE PROCESS, 6 7 AT A MINIMUM, REQUIRES AT LEAST AN INITIAL DETERMINATION OF PROBABLE CAUSE FOR EVEN JUST CONTINUED DETAINMENT 9 FOLLOWED BY A VERY PROMPT HEARING ON THE ISSUE OF WHETHER 10 OR NOT HE WOULD BE SEXUALLY DANGEROUS UNDER THE STATUTE, 11 EVEN ASSUMING THE STATUTE ON ITS FACE WAS CONSTITUTIONAL. 12 AND THAT'S WHAT MAKES THE HABEAS PETITION NECESSARY HERE, 1.3 IS THAT THOSE PROCEDURES THAT ARE PURPORTEDLY PROVIDED IN 14 4248 ARE INSUFFICIENT TO PROVIDE HIM WITH THE 15 CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIONS. 16 THE COURT: WELL, BUT YOU NEED TO DEAL WITH THAT 17 BECAUSE I THINK THERE'S A VERY REAL CHANCE THAT THE APPELLATE COURT IS GOING TO SAY WELL, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE 18 19 PROTECTIONS IN 4248, THAT'S WHAT YOU NEED TO DO AND YOU 20 CAN'T HAVE HABEAS CORPUS. THAT CUTS THE HEART OUT OF 21 HABEAS CORPUS, IT WOULD SEEM. 22 NOW, THERE ARE -- TO WHAT EXTENT DO PRISONERS IN 23 FEDERAL PRISONS WHO BRING HABEAS PETITIONS HAVE TO GO 24 THROUGH INTERNAL ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES, GRIEVANCE

PROCEDURES, BEFORE THEY CAN MAKE VALID 2241 OR 2255

CLAIMS?

1.3

MR. BAYZLE: YOUR HONOR, I'M NOT AWARE OF

INTERNAL PROCEDURES THAT THEY MUST DO IN ORDER TO FILE A

HABEAS PETITION. BUT AGAIN, I WILL ADMIT THIS IS NOT

SOMETHING THAT I HAVE A LOT OF EXPERIENCE IN THE LAW IN

THAT REGARD.

THE COURT: OKAY. I THINK THAT'S AN ANALOGOUS SITUATION THAT YOU MIGHT WANT TO LOOK AT BECAUSE, YOU KNOW, A BIG AREA OF EXHAUSTION IN HABEAS IS TAKEN UP BY THE COMITY BETWEEN FEDERAL AND STATE COURTS, BUT THAT'S NOT INVOLVED HERE. TO THE EXTENT THAT GETS COMMINGLED IN THE THINKING, THAT'S A MISTAKE. THERE'S NO DUAL SOVEREIGNS, THERE'S NO FEDERALISM OR COMITY INVOLVED HERE AT ALL. IT WOULD ONLY BE WHETHER HIERARCHICALLY AN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE OR SOME OTHER SET OF RULES CAN PRECLUDE YOUR RIGHT TO EXAMINE YOUR DETENTION OR CUSTODY WITH HABEAS, AS I SEE IT.

MR. BAYZLE: I'LL JUST SAY, IN THIS CASE IT IS
THE ABILITY TO OBVIOUSLY DETAIN SOMEONE AND KEEP THEM IN
DETENTION FOR NOW NINE MONTHS PAST THE RELEASE DATE
WITHOUT ANY HEARING WHATSOEVER OR ANY INITIAL
DETERMINATION. IT MAKES IT VERY DIFFICULT TO CHALLENGE
THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE STATUTE WHEN THERE ARE NO
HEARINGS PROVIDED AT THE ONSET TO EVEN INITIATE THOSE
CHALLENGE.

SO THAT PROCESS OF HAVING TO GO THROUGH 4248 ASSUMES
THAT SOMEONE HAS TO BASICALLY GIVE UP THEIR LIBERTY
INTERESTS FOR A GOOD LONG TIME BEFORE THEY ARE EVEN
ALLOWED TO HAVE ANY TYPE OF FORUM TO EVEN CHALLENGE THE
CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE DETENTION.

THE COURT: I'M JUST GIVING YOU A WORD TO THE
WISE, THERE'S A SERIOUS CHANCE THAT THE APPELLATE COURTS
WILL COLLAPSE HABEAS CORPUS INTO 4248, EITHER
INTENTIONALLY OR UNINTENTIONALLY, IF THEY COME UP WITH AN
EXHAUSTION PREREQUISITE.

ANYWAY, DO YOU KNOW, AND YOU PROBABLY DO, WHAT THE EXHAUSTION REQUIREMENTS ARE IN EITHER 2255 OR 2241, PROBABLY IN 2241. IF YOU ARE IN THE BOP AND YOU MAKE A CLAIM, CONDITIONS OF CONFINEMENT OR SOMETHING LIKE THAT, DO YOU HAVE TO GO THROUGH AN ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESS?

MR. ACKER: I BELIEVE SO, YOUR HONOR. I THINK
THE COURTS HAVE, UNDER SOME CIRCUMSTANCES, EXCUSED PEOPLE
BASED ON THE ISSUE OF FUTILITY OR THE DETERMINATION THAT
IT WOULD HAVE BEEN FUTILE. BUT OTHER THAN THAT, I BELIEVE
IN A NORMAL CRIMINAL MATTER WHERE SOMEBODY IS CHALLENGING
THEIR -- IN THE CUSTODY OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL IN A
CRIMINAL SENTENCE AND THEY ARE CHALLENGING CONDITIONS OF
CONFINEMENT, THEY NORMALLY DO HAVE TO EXHAUST THEIR
ADMINISTRATIVE REMEDIES PRIOR TO FILING A HABEAS.

THE COURT: THAT MAY BE A GOOD ANSWER FOR YOU.

I DON'T KNOW THAT IT WAS MADE TO THE APPELLATE COURT, BUT 1 2 THAT THE DOMAIN THAT EXHAUSTION APPLIES IS IN THE CRIMINAL 3 DOMAIN. 4 MR. BAYZLE: YES, SIR. 5 THE COURT: NOT IN THE CIVIL DOMAIN. BECAUSE NO ONE HAS HERETOFORE SAID THAT 4248 PEOPLE WHO ARE IN CIVIL 6 7 CUSTODY, IF THEY HAVE A GRIEVANCE ABOUT THE CONDITIONS OF CONFINEMENT AS SUCH, THAT THEY WOULD HAVE TO EXHAUST, HAVE 8 9 THEY? IF THEY DON'T LIKE THE FOOD AT MARYLAND, IF THEY 10 DON'T LIKE ONE OF THE DETAILS OF LIFE AT MARYLAND. 11 MR. ACKER: I DON'T BELIEVE THAT'S COME UP. THE COURT: THEY'RE TOO FOCUSED ON GETTING OUT 12 13 AND NOT ON STAYING IN AND MAKING IT A BETTER PLACE, SO 14 FAR. 15 MR. ACKER: THAT'S GENERALLY TRUE, I BELIEVE. THE COURT: OKAY. SO YOU ARE LOOKING FOR A 16 17 RULING ON YOUR 2241? MR. BAYZLE: YES, YOUR HONOR. THERE'S THAT 18 19 MATTER AND THEN THE OTHER PENDING ISSUE WOULD BE THE 20 GOVERNMENT'S MOTION TO STAY, WHICH WE HAVE ALSO FILED A 21 MOTION IN OPPOSITION. MOTION TO STAY SEEMS TO BE BASED ON UNTIL THE 4TH CIRCUIT RULES. IT WOULD REDUCE THE NEEDLESS 22 23 EXPENDITURE OF RESOURCES TO GO ON WITH A HABEAS PETITION.

THAT ARGUMENT IGNORES THE FAR GREATER COST THAT

WE OBVIOUSLY DISAGREE WITH THAT AND JUST THINK THAT

24

MR. OFARRIT HAS BEEN PAYING AND WILL CONTINUE TO PAY IN 1 2 DETENTION. 3 THE COURT: THANK YOU. YOU HAVE BRIEFED THAT? 4 MR. ACKER: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: IF I DON'T STAY IT, ARE YOU 5 SATISFIED WITH YOUR BRIEFING ON THE 2241? 6 7 MR. ACKER: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE COURT: OKAY. THANK YOU. MS. LITTLE, DO 8 9 YOU HAVE ANYTHING YOU WANT TO ADD? 10 MS. LITTLE: NO, YOUR HONOR, EXCEPT WE WILL BE FILING THAT SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION NEXT WEEK. 11 12 THE COURT: OKAY. 13 MR. ACKER: IF THEY FILE A SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION, 14 WE WOULD LIKE THE OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND TO THAT. 15 THE COURT: THIS IS A SUPPLEMENTAL MOTION TO 16 JOIN IN THE BRONCHEAU CASES? 17 MS. LITTLE: THAT'S CORRECT. MR. ACKER: AND WE'LL DO THAT QUICKLY. 18 19 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. WE'LL GIVE YOU FIVE DAYS 20 AND FIVE DAYS TO DO THAT. IT'S NOT VERY INVOLVED, YOU JUST HAVE TO PARROT WHAT WAS IN THE OTHER CASES. 21 MS. LITTLE: RIGHT. 22 23 MR. ACKER: THE ONLY THING I WOULD SAY, YOUR 24 HONOR, IS THAT I THINK THE RULES ARE TRYING TO GO TO 25 CALENDAR DAYS INSTEAD OF BUSINESS DAYS. I REQUEST IT BE

1	SEVEN CALENDAR DAYS RATHER THAN FIVE BUSINESS DAYS.
2	THE COURT: I'LL DO THAT, SEVEN CALENDAR DAYS.
3	MR. ACKER: THANK YOU.
4	THE COURT: THANK YOU FOR APPEARING AND FOR
5	REPRESENTING HIM.
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	END OF TRANSCRIPT
21	
22	
23	
24 25	

CERTIFICATE THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS TAKEN AT THE CIVIL SESSION OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT IS A TRUE AND ACCURATE TRANSCRIPTION OF THE PROCEEDINGS TAKEN BY ME IN MACHINE SHORTHAND AND TRANSCRIBED BY COMPUTER UNDER MY SUPERVISION. THIS THE 15TH DAY OF JANUARY, 2011. /S/ DONNA J. TOMAWSKI DONNA J. TOMAWSKI OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER